

### REMARKS

In response to the restriction requirement set forth in the Office Action mailed December 17, 2007, Applicant hereby elects Species A for continued examination with traverse. Claims 24 and 49 have been amended to include limitations similar to those of claim 23 so that Species A reads on claims 23-26, 29-32, 34, 36-38, and 40-49.


The Examiner states that Applicant's amendments necessitated the restriction and that there is an examination and search burden for the patentably distinct species A ("[w]herein the object is irradiated twice (e.g., see claims 23 and 29)") and species B ("[w]herein the object is irradiated only once (e.g., see claims 24 and 49)"). (Office Action, page 2-3). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant submits that none of the claims recite that an object is irradiated only once or only twice, and that none of the claims are so limited. Furthermore, claim 23 was amended by Applicant in the Reply filed on November 1, 2007 to incorporate the limitations of claims 27 and 28. The Examiner has previously searched for and examined claims 23, 27, and 28 as described by the Examiner in the Office Action of March 19, 2007. Therefore, because the Examiner previously searched for and examined claims 23, 27, and 28, the Examiner cannot reasonably claim that the combination of claims 23, 27, and 28 necessitated a restriction requirement. Nor can the Examiner reasonably claim that it is a burden to continue to search for and examine both species when the Examiner has previously done so.

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: January 15, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Stephen A. Soffen

Registration No.: 31,063

David T. Beck

Registration No.: 54,985

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street, NW

Washington, DC 20006-5403

(202) 420-2200

Attorneys for Applicant